



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/763,526	01/23/2004	George P. Copeland	13768.471	9211

47973 7590 01/28/2008
WORKMAN NYDEGGER/MICROSOFT
1000 EAGLE GATE TOWER
60 EAST SOUTH TEMPLE
SALT LAKE CITY, UT 84111

EXAMINER

WONG, JOSEPH D

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2168

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

01/28/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/763,526

Applicant(s)

COPELAND ET AL.

Examiner

Joseph D. Wong

Art Unit

2168

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 January 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-48 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-48 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 23 January 2004 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 20040123.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

Claims 21-41, 44-48 are rejected for being directed towards nonstatutory subject matter.

Claim 21 appears directed to a computer program product for use in a computer system that includes one or more processors and system memory....comprising one or more computer readable media. The claimed limitation "computer-readable media" appears to invoke computer executable instructions on communications media which are defined to include according to the instant specification paragraphs [0028], by recitation:

"Communications media typically embody computer-readable instructions, data structures, program modules, or other data in a modulated data signal such as a carrier wave or other transport mechanism and include any information-delivery media. By way of example, and not limitation, communications media include wired media, such as wired networks and direct-wired connections, and wireless media such as acoustic, radio, infrared, and other wireless media. The term computer-readable media as used herein includes both storage media and communications media. may be stored or transmitted via a data transmission medium, such as a signal on a communications link".

Energy is not a series of steps or acts and thus is not a process. Energy is not a physical article and as such is not a machine or manufacture. Energy is not a combination of substances and therefore is not a composition of matter. Energy is not one of the four categories of invention and therefore not statutory. Energy is not one of the four categories of invention and therefore not statutory. Claims 22-41 are rejected because depend from claim 21.

Claim 44 appears directed to one or more computer-readable media having thereon a data structure. However, the data structure recites non-functional descriptive material because it does not show a functional or logical relationship between the elements of information. Also it does not appear to show the function being realized with the structure becoming structurally and functionally related to the medium. See MPEP 2106.01 (September 2007), second paragraph. Accordingly, claims 45-48 are rejected under the same reasoning.

Applicants can look to MPEP 2106.01-2106.02 (September 2007), Interim Guidelines for Examination of Patent Applications for Patent Subject Matter Eligibility, Instant Specification, and contemporary case law with a matching fact pattern for further suggestions that may be helpful in overcoming these rejections.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1-20 are rejected under 35 USC 112, 2nd paragraph because the claims are confusing by defining a system, process, and method within the same claim set. See MPEP 2173.05(p)(II) (September 2007).

MPEP 2173.05(p)(II) states:

A single claim which claims both an apparatus and the method steps of using the apparatus is indefinite under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph. *> IPXL Holdings v. Amazon.com, Inc., 430 F.2d 1377, 1384, 77 USPQ2d 1140, 1145 (Fed. Cir. 2005);< Ex parte Lyell, 17 USPQ2d 1548 (Bd. Pat. App. & Inter. 1990) *>

Claims 21-41 are rejected under 35 USC 112, 2nd paragraph because the claims assert a computer program product and computer system and a method claim within the same preamble raising concerns rendering the claims confusing. See MPEP 2173.05(p)(II).

Claims 42-43 are rejected under 35 USC 112, 2nd paragraph, for the same reasons as set forth in claim 1.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1-11, 14-16, 21-34, 44, 46-48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Ganesh et al., US Patent 6,295,610 B1, Filed 17 September 1998, Patent Date 25 September 2001, hereinafter Ganesh.

Regarding claim 1, Ganesh teaches a computing system that includes one or more processors and system memory (Fig. 2, items 204, 206 and 210), a method for the computing system to execute a transaction of one or more methods in a manner that the effects of the transaction may be at least partially undone even though a custom inversion process was not previously constructed for the transaction (Fig. 5, 8, wherein the customized inversion

process is interpreted to include step 810's "apply undo changes to a particular block" analogously shown in Fig. 7, 9, 10, 12), the method comprising the following: an act of maintaining a mapping between each of a plurality of groups of one or more direct methods with a corresponding group of one or more inversion methods that, when executed by the one or more processors of the computing system (Fig. 7A-2, wherein the mapping corresponds to undo data mapped with arrowed lines connecting transaction list to an undo sequence), cause the computing system to at least partially undo the effects of the execution of the corresponding group of one or more direct methods (Fig. 4 item 432; Fig. 9, items 1008, 1010 and Fig. 11-2, undo block 1102); an act of beginning a transaction (Fig. 8, item 800 or Fig. 10, item 1050 or 12, item 1200, wherein the beginning is met by a first execution step); an act of running a group of one or more direct methods as at least part of the transaction, (Fig. 9, wherein the undo data of items 1008, 1010 and 1012, appear to identify specific changes to make to particular rows to undo a transaction also seen in Fig. 11-2 and Fig. 15) the group being one of the plurality of groups of one or more direct methods; an act of using the mapping to identify the corresponding group of one or more inversion methods

corresponding to the group of one or more direct methods; (Fig. 15, wherein the group is interpreted to include containers "Container #A, #B" as illustrated) and an act of recording the identity of the corresponding group of one or more inversion methods in a compensation record for the transaction. (Fig. 11-2, wherein the compensation record is interpreted to include "undo record 1104-1106" as per "container #722")

Regarding claim 2, Ganesh teaches a method in accordance, wherein the group of one or more direct methods is a first group of one or more transactions and the corresponding group of one or more inversion methods is a first group of one or more inversion methods, the method further comprising the following: an act of running a second group of one or more direct methods as at least part of the transaction, the second group being one of the plurality of groups of one or more direct methods; an act of using the mapping to identify the corresponding second group of one or more inversion methods corresponding to the second group of one or more direct methods; and an act of recording the identity of the corresponding second group of one or more inversion methods in the compensation record. (Fig. 11-2, see container #722)

Regarding claim 3, Ganesh teaches a method in accordance, further comprising the following: an act of committing the transaction. (Fig. 11-1, see slot 0 "committed")

Regarding claim 4, Ganesh teaches a method in accordance, further comprising the following: an act of saving the compensation record to a persistent media upon the act of committing the transaction. (Col. 1, 36-40, wherein the persistent media is interpreted to include a disk)

Regarding claim 5, Ganesh teaches a method in accordance, further comprising the following: an act of determining that the transaction should be compensated; and an act of executing the inversion methods identified in the compensation group corresponding to the transaction. (Fig. 7A-2, see lines connecting transaction to undo)

Regarding claim 6, Ganesh teaches a method in accordance, wherein the transaction is a first transaction and the transaction record is a first transaction record, the method first comprising the following: an act of beginning a second

transaction; an act of running a third group of one or more direct methods as at least part of the second transaction, the third group being one of the plurality of groups of one or more direct methods; an act of using the mapping to identify the corresponding third group of one or more inversion methods corresponding to the third group of one or more direct methods; and an act of recording the identity of the corresponding third group of one or more inversion methods in a compensation record for the second transaction. (Fig. 7A-2, Fig. 11; Fig. 15)

Regarding claim 7, Ganesh teaches a method in accordance, further comprising the following: an act of committing the second transaction. (Fig. 7A-2; Fig. 9; Fig. 11; Fig. 15)

Regarding claim 8, Ganesh teaches a method in accordance, wherein the first and second transaction are part of the same larger transaction. (Fig. 7A-2; Fig. 9; Fig. 11; Fig. 15)

Regarding claim 9, Ganesh teaches a method in accordance, further comprising the following: an act of determining whether a larger transaction should be compensated; an act of executing the inversion methods identified in the first compensation

record corresponding to the first transaction in response to the act of determining; and an act of executing the inversion methods identified in the second compensation group corresponding to the second transaction in response to the act of determining. (Fig. 7A-2; Fig. 9; Fig. 11; Fig.15)

Regarding claim 10, Ganesh teaches a method in accordance, further comprising the following: an act of saving the second compensation record to a persistent media. (Fig. 7A-2; Fig. 9; Fig. 11; Fig.15)

Regarding claim 11, Ganesh does not explicitly teach a method in accordance, further comprising the following: an act of receiving a message, wherein the act of beginning the transaction is performed in response to receiving a message. (Col. 6, Lines 55-61)

Regarding claim 14, Ganesh teaches method in accordance, wherein each of the plurality of groups of one or more direct methods each comprise a single method. (Fig. 12, see step 1200; Fig. 7A-2; Fig. 9; Fig. 11; Fig. 12; Fig.15)

Regarding claim 15, Ganesh teaches a method in accordance, wherein each of the plurality of groups of one or more inverted methods each comprise a single inverted method. (Fig. 12, see step 1210; Fig. 7A-2; Fig. 9; Fig. 11; Fig.15)

Regarding claim 16, Ganesh teaches a method in accordance, wherein each of the plurality of groups of one or more inverted methods each comprises a single inverted method. (Fig. 12, see step 1210; Fig. 7A-2; Fig. 9; Fig. 11; Fig. 15)

Regarding claim 21, Ganesh teaches a computer program product for use in a computing system that includes one or more processors and system memory (Claim 10, Fig. 2), the computer program product for performing a method for the computing system to execute a transaction of one or more methods in a manner that the effects of the transaction may be at least partially undone even though a custom inversion process was not previously constructed for the transaction (Fig. 8, items 802, 806, wherein the effect of the transaction is deemed to be partially undone by blocking operation not shown to be previously constructed for

the transaction, interpreted to be a negative limitation that is negatively met because as the reference does omits the previous construction), the computer program product comprising one or more computer-readable media having thereon computer-executable instructions that (Fig. 2, claim 10), when executed by the one or more processors (Fig. 2), cause the computing system to perform the following: an act of maintaining a mapping between each of a plurality of groups of one or more direct methods with a corresponding group of one or more inversion methods that (Fig. 4, 7A, 7A-2, 9, interpreted to include undo records connected with arrowed lines to transaction records which meet the limitation of a mapping), when executed by the one or more processors of the computing system, cause the computing system to at least partially undo the effects of the execution of the corresponding group of one or more direct methods (Fig. 3, wherein the direct method corresponds to transaction slots 0, 2 because they are "committed" operation as shown under item 340 in the table with other examples shown in Figs. 4, 7A-1, 7A-2, 9); an act of beginning a transaction (Fig. 8, item 800 or Fig. 10, item 1050 or 12, item 1200, wherein the beginning is met by a first execution step); an act of running a group of one or more direct methods as at least part of the transaction, the

group being one of the plurality of groups of one or more direct methods (Fig. 7A-2, wherein the groups correspond to "containers #722, #730); an act of using the mapping to identify the corresponding group of one or more inversion methods corresponding to the group of one or more direct methods (Fig. 4, 7A-2, wherein the direct method is corresponded by following the lined arrows to containerized transactions seen in Fig. 4's "undo" pointer); and an act of recording the identity of the corresponding group of one or more inversion methods in a compensation record for the transaction. (Fig. 9, wherein compensation records are met by "undo record" examples 1002, 1004, 1006)

Regarding claim 22, Ganesh teaches a computer program product in accordance, wherein the group of one or more direct methods is a first group of one or more transactions and the corresponding group of one or more inversion methods is a first group of one or more inversion methods, the computer program product further having thereon computer-executable instructions that, when executed by the one or more processors, further cause the computing system to perform the following (see Claim 10): an act of running a second group of one or more direct methods as

at least part of the transaction, the second group being one of the plurality of groups of one or more direct methods; an act of using the mapping to identify the corresponding second group of one or more inversion methods corresponding to the second group of one or more direct methods; and an act of recording the identity of the corresponding second group of one or more inversion methods in the compensation record. (Fig. 9, Fig. 7A-1, Fig. 7A-2, wherein "inversion method" corresponds to an "undo ptr")

Regarding claim 23, Ganesh teaches a computer program product in accordance, the computer program product further having thereon computer-executable instructions that, when executed by the one or more processors (see Claim 10), further cause the computing system to perform the following: an act of committing the transaction. (Fig. 7, item "committed")

Regarding claim 24, Ganesh teaches a computer program product in accordance, the computer program product further having thereon computer-executable instructions that, when executed by the one or more processors (see Claim 10), further cause the computing system to perform the following: an act of

saving the compensation record to a persistent media upon the act of committing the transaction. (Fig. 7, item "committed"; Fig. 2, Col. 1, Lines 35-37)

Regarding claim 25, Ganesh teaches a computer program product in accordance, the computer program product further having thereon computer-executable instructions that, when executed by the one or more processors, further cause the computing system to perform the following: an act of determining that the transaction should be compensated; and an act of executing the inversion methods identified in the compensation group corresponding to the transaction. (Fig. 7A-2, Fig. 14B; Fig. 16A-16B, see "'undo record" steps)

Regarding claim 26, Ganesh teaches a computer program product in accordance, wherein the transaction is a first transaction and the compensation record is a first compensation record, the computer program product further having thereon computer-executable instructions that, when executed by the one or more processors, further cause the computing system to perform the following: an act of beginning a second transaction; an act of running a third group of one or more direct methods as

at least part of the second transaction, the third group being one of the plurality of groups of one or more direct methods; an act of using the mapping to identify the corresponding third group of one or more inversion methods corresponding to the third group of one or more direct methods; and an act of recording the identity of the corresponding third group of one or more inversion methods in a compensation record for the second transaction. (Fig. 7A-2, Fig. 14B; Fig. 16A-16B, see "undo record" steps)

Regarding claim 27, Ganesh teaches a computer program product in accordance, the computer program product further having thereon computer-executable instructions that, when executed by the one or more processors, further cause the computing system to perform the following: an act of committing the second transaction. (Fig. 7a-1, Fig. 11-1, see "committed" status field)

Regarding claim 28, Ganesh teaches a computer program product in accordance, wherein the first and second transaction are part of the same larger transaction. (Col. 20, Lines 16-25, interpreted to include "per-block rollback context")

Regarding claim 29, Ganesh teaches a computer program product in accordance, further comprising the following: an act of determining whether a larger transaction should be compensated; an act of executing the inversion methods identified in the first compensation group corresponding to the first transaction in response to the act of determining; and an act of executing the inversion methods identified in the second compensation group corresponding to the second transaction.

(Fig. 7A-2, see containers #722, #730)

Regarding claim 30, Ganesh teaches a computer program product in accordance, further comprising the following: an act of saving the second compensation record to a persistent media. (Col. 1, 36-40, wherein the persistent media is interpreted to include a disk)

Regarding claim 31, Ganesh teaches a computer program product in accordance, further comprising the following: an act of receiving a message, wherein the act of beginning the transaction is performed in response to receiving the message. (Col. 11, Lines 51-56)

Regarding claim 32, Ganesh teaches a method in accordance 21, wherein each of the plurality of groups of one or more direct methods each comprise a single method. (Fig. 12, see step 1200; Fig. 7A-2; Fig. 9; Fig. 11; Fig. 12; Fig.15)

Regarding claim 33, Ganesh teaches a method in accordance 32, wherein each of the plurality of groups of one or more inverted methods each comprise a single inverted method. (Fig. 12, see step 1200; Fig. 7A-2; Fig. 9; Fig. 11; Fig. 12; Fig.15)

Regarding claim 34, Ganesh teaches a method in accordance 21, wherein each of the plurality of groups of one or more inverted methods each comprises a single inverted method. (Fig. 12, see step 1200; Fig. 7A-2; Fig. 9; Fig. 11; Fig. 12; Fig.15)

Regarding claim 39, Ganesh teaches a computer program product in accordance, wherein the one or more computer-readable media are physical memory media. (Fig. 2, item 206 or Col. 1, L36-40)

Regarding claim 40, Ganesh teaches a computer program product in accordance, wherein the physical memory media include system memory. (Fig. 2, item 206)

Regarding claim 41, Ganesh teaches a computer program product in accordance, wherein the physical memory media include a persistent media. (Col. 1, 36-40, wherein the persistent media is interpreted to include a disk)

Regarding claim 42, Ganesh teaches a computing system that includes one or more processors and system memory (Fig. 2, items 204, 206), a method for the computing system to execute a transaction of one or more methods in a manner that the effects of the transaction may be at least partially undone even though a custom inversion process was not previously constructed for the transaction (see Title; Fig. 16A, items 1606, 1610, wherein the limitation is interpreted to be met by applying the change information in the undo record), the method comprising the following: an act of maintaining a mapping between each of a plurality of groups of one or more direct methods with a corresponding group of one or more inversion methods that (Fig. 16B, see item 1620, wherein the limitation is interpreted to be

met by applying an alternate undo record and the group is interpreted to be met by a "container" as seen in Fig. 7A-2, and Fig. 11-2), when executed by the one or more processors of the computing system (Fig. 2), cause the computing system to at least partially undo the effects of the execution of the corresponding group of one or more direct methods (Fig. 11-2, see container); an step for performing the transaction in a manner that the mapping is used to automatically generate compensation procedures that when executed by the one or more processors, cause the computing system to at least partially undo the effects of the transaction. (Fig. 7A-2, interpreted to be met by also by "redo log buffer" see in Col. 1, Lines 38-39; Col. 3, Lines 55-59)

Regarding claim 43, Ganesh teaches a method in accordance 42, wherein the step for performing the transaction comprises the following: act of beginning a transaction; an act of running a group of one or more direct methods as at least part of the transaction, the group being one of the plurality of groups of one or more direct methods; an act of using the mapping to identify the corresponding group of one or more inversion methods corresponding to the group of one or more direct

methods; and an act of recording the identity of the corresponding group of one or more inversion methods in a compensation record for the transaction. (Fig. 7A-2, see container #, Col. 3, Lines 57-59)

Regarding claim 44, Ganesh teaches one or more computer-readable media having thereon a data structure, the data structure comprising the following: a transaction identifier field that identifies a committed transaction of one or more groups of one or more direct methods (Fig. 3A, wherein direct is interpreted to be a transaction with a direct pointer); and a compensation record field that identifies one or more inverted methods that, when executed, at least partially undo the effect of execution of the direct methods in the committed transaction. (Title, wherein "recovering" is undoing as seen in Figs. 7A-1, wherein "committed" in transaction table #7 meets the limitation, also see Fig. 7A-2, Fig. 9, 11-2, Fig. 15)

Regarding claim 46, Ganesh teaches one or more computer-readable media in accordance, wherein the one or more computer-readable media are physical memory media. (Fig. 2, item 206)

Regarding claim 47, Ganesh teaches one or more computer-readable media in accordance, wherein the physical memory media is system memory. (Fig. 2, item 206)

Regarding claim 48, Ganesh teaches one or more computer-readable media in accordance, wherein the physical memory media is a persistent media. (Fig. 2, item 206; Col. 11, Line 55)

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ganesh et al., US Patent 6,295,610 B1, Filed 17 September 1998, Patent Date 25 September 2001, hereinafter Ganesh in view of in view of Craig et al., US Patent 6,757,708 B1; Filed 3 Mar 2000; Patent Date 29 Jun 2004, hereinafter Craig .

Regarding claim 12, Ganesh and Kesler do not explicitly teach a method in accordance 11, wherein the message is a HyperText Transport Protocol (HTTP) message.

However, Craig teaches method in accordance 11, wherein the message is a HyperText Transport Protocol (HTTP) message. (Col. 3, Lines 40-49)

Ganesh and Craig are analogous art pertinent to the problem to be solved. A skilled artisan would have been motivated to combine Ganesh and Craig because it provides for applications which typically require state information are internet shopping and e-commerce as discussed in Craig, (Col. 3, Lines 35-45).

Therefore at the time of invention, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art to combine Ganesh and Craig because it provides for applications which typically require state information are internet shopping and e-commerce as discussed in Craig as suggested in Craig, (Col. 3, Lines 35-45).

Claims 13, 17-20, 35-38, 45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ganesh et al., US Patent 6,295,610 B1, Filed 17 September 1998, Patent Date 25 September 2001, hereinafter Ganesh in view of Kesler, US Patent 7,062,502 B1; Filed 28 Dec. 2001, Patent Date 13 June 2006.

Regarding claim 13, Ganesh does not explicitly teach the method in accordance, wherein the message is a Simple Object Access Protocol (SOAP) message.

However, Kesler teaches the method in accordance, wherein the message is a Simple Object Access Protocol (SOAP) message. (Col. 38, Lines 5-10)

Ganesh and Kesler are analogous art pertinent to the problem to be solved. A skilled artisan would have been motivated to combine Ganesh and Kesler because it provides for dynamically generating data entry forms at run-time without writing computer code as discussed in Kesler, Col. 3, Lines 7-8.

Therefore at the time of invention, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art to combine Ganesh and Kesler because it provides for dynamically generating data entry forms at run-time without writing computer code as suggested in Kesler, Col. 3, Lines 7-8.

Regarding claim 17, Ganesh teaches a method in accordance, wherein the act of maintaining a mapping comprises the following for at least one of the one or more direct methods in the group of one or more direct methods. (Fig. 4, Fig. 7A-2, Fig. 9)

However, Ganesh does not explicitly teach an act of listing one or more parameters for the direct method that should be in the inverted method. (Col. 19, Table 8, see "Description", second column, "parameters may be passed to the SQL statement from the data entry from" adjacent to SQL expression type heading and also under "stored procedure" and "expression", 4th line above SQL)

Ganesh and Kesler are analogous art pertinent to the problem to be solved. A skilled artisan would have been motivated to combine Ganesh and Kesler because it provides for cost savings associated with dynamic SQL and compatibility with commercial middleware products as discussed in Kesler, Col.17, lines 13-14 and 30-35 respectively.

Therefore at the time of invention, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art to combine Ganesh and Kesler because it provides for cost savings associated with dynamic SQL and compatibility with commercial middleware products as suggested in Kesler, Col. 17, lines 13-14 and 30-35 respectively.

Regarding claim 18, Ganesh does not explicitly teach a method in accordance, wherein the act of running a group of one or more direct methods comprises the following: an act of running the direct method using particular values corresponding to the one or more listed parameters.

However, Kesler teaches a method in accordance, wherein the act of running a group of one or more direct methods comprises the following: an act of running the direct method using particular values corresponding to the one or more listed parameters. (Col. 19, Table 8, see analysis under claim 17)

Further analysis provided under claim 17.

Regarding claim 19, Ganesh does not explicitly teach a method in accordance, further comprising the following: an act of recording values for the one or more listed parameters for the direct method in the compensation record.

However, Kesler teaches a method in accordance, further comprising the following: an act of recording values for the one or more listed parameters for the direct method in the compensation record. (Col. 19, Table 8, see analysis under claim 17)

Further analysis provided under claim 17.

Regarding claim 20, Ganesh teaches does not explicitly teach a method in accordance, further comprising the following: an act of determining that the transaction should be compensated; and an act of executing the inversion methods identified in the compensation group corresponding to the transaction, wherein the inversion method corresponding to the direct method is executed using the recorded values in the compensation record.

However, Kesler teaches a method in accordance, further comprising the following: an act of determining that the transaction should be compensated; and an act of executing the inversion methods identified in the compensation group corresponding to the transaction, wherein the inversion method corresponding to the direct method is executed using the recorded values in the compensation record. (Col. 19, Table 8, see analysis under claim 17)

Regarding claim 35, Ganesh does not explicitly teach a method in accordance, wherein the act of maintaining a mapping comprises the following for at least one of the one or more direct methods in the group of one or more direct methods: an act of listing one or more parameters for the direct method that should be in the inverted method.

However, Kesler teaches a method in accordance, wherein the act of maintaining a mapping comprises the following for at least one of the one or more direct methods in the group of one or more direct methods: an act of listing one or more parameters for the direct method that should be in the inverted method. (Col. 19, Table 8, see analysis under claim 17)

Regarding claim 36, Ganesh does not explicitly teach a method in accordance, wherein the act of running a group of one or more direct methods comprises the following: an act of running the direct method using particular values corresponding to the one or more listed parameters.

However, Kesler teaches a method in accordance, wherein the act of running a group of one or more direct methods comprises the following: an act of running the direct method using particular values corresponding to the one or more listed parameters. (Col. 19, Table 8, see analysis under claim 17)

Regarding claim 37, Ganesh does not explicitly teach a method in accordance, further comprising the following: an act of recording values for the one or more listed parameters for the direct method in the compensation record.

However, Kesler teaches a method in accordance, further comprising the following: an act of recording values for the one or more listed parameters for the direct method in the compensation record. (Col. 19, Table 8, see analysis under claim 17)

Regarding claim 38, Ganesh does not explicitly teach a method in accordance, further comprising the following: an act of determining that the transaction should be compensated; and an act of executing the inversion methods identified in the compensation group corresponding to the transaction, wherein the inversion method corresponding to the direct method is executed using the recorded values in the compensation record.

However, Kesler teaches a method in accordance, further comprising the following: an act of determining that the transaction should be compensated; and an act of executing the inversion methods identified in the compensation group corresponding to the transaction, wherein the inversion method corresponding to the direct method is executed using the recorded values in the compensation record. (Col. 19, Table 8, see analysis under claim 17)

Regarding claim 45, Ganesh does not explicitly teach one or more computer-readable media in accordance, wherein the compensation record field further include the following for at least one of the direct methods; a parameter value field that records the actual value used for at least one of the parameters used when running the direct method during the transaction.

However, Kesler teaches one or more computer-readable media in accordance, wherein the compensation record field further include the following for at least one of the direct methods; a parameter value field that records the actual value used for at least one of the parameters used when running the direct method during the transaction. (Col. 19, Table 8, see analysis under claim 17)

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Joseph D. Wong whose telephone number is 571-270-1015. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon.-Thur. 8:30AM - 6:00PM and alternate Fridays.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tim T. Vo can be reached on (571) 272-3642. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Application/Control Number:
10/763,526
Art Unit: 2168

Page 28

Joseph D. Wong
TTV/jdw
/JDW/
11 January 2008

Tim T. Vo
SPE, Art Unit 2168

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be 'Tim T. Vo', with a large, sweeping initial 'T' and a stylized 'V'.

TIM VO
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100